

# Testing models for structural relaxation of viscous liquids by temperature jump experiments

N. B. Olsen, T. Christensen, and J. C. Dyre  
*Department of Mathematics and Physics (IMFUFA),  
 Roskilde University, Postbox 260, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark*

Based on the Tool-Narayanaswami formalism for structural relaxation we propose an experiment which independent of the relaxation time distribution determines the structural relaxation rate by subtracting relaxations following two different temperature jumps. In particular, the experiment makes it possible to evaluate the relaxation rate immediately following a temperature jump - thus allowing one to distinguish the entropy model from others.

The glass transition takes place when the relaxation time of a viscous liquid upon cooling becomes comparable to the cooling time. What determines the relaxation time is still a matter of debate. In this note [1] we discuss an experiment which makes it possible to distinguish between two fundamentally different types of models for the relaxation time.

Before proceeding let us briefly mention three phenomenological models for the relaxation time. These models are often just discussed in connection with linear experiments, i.e., experiments monitoring the equilibrium liquid, but all three models have obvious extensions to deal with structural relaxation. Writing for the relaxation time  $\tau$

$$\tau = \tau_0 \exp(W), \quad (1)$$

the three phenomenological models are: The entropy model ( $W \propto 1/TS_c$  where  $S_c$  is the configurational entropy per molecule), the free volume model ( $W \propto 1/v_f$  where  $v_f$  is the free volume per molecule), and the shoving model [2] ( $W \propto G_\infty/T$  where  $G_\infty$  is the instantaneous shear modulus). The quantities  $S_c$ ,  $v_f$  and  $G_\infty$  are all temperature dependent - this is how the models are supposed to explain the non-Arrhenius temperature dependence of  $\tau$ .

The entropy model differs from the two others in one important respect: Suppose temperature is changed “instantaneously,” i.e., much faster than the liquid relaxation time. Clearly, the quantity  $S_c$  cannot change instantaneously. In contrast, both  $v_f$  and  $G_\infty$  have “glassy” contributions to their temperature dependence and thus do change with temperature even on a very fast time scale. Consequently, a study of how the relaxation rate changes after an instantaneous temperature jump makes it possible to distinguish the entropy model from the two other models. Such an experiment answers the question: *How large is the instantaneous change of the relaxation rate?*

Structural relaxation is generally nonlinear and thus much less well established theoretically than linear response theory. Nevertheless there exists a simple and beautiful extension of linear response theory to structural relaxation, applicable as long as only reasonably small temperature jumps are involved. This is the Tool-Narayanaswami (TN) formalism. The idea is that linear response theory still applies, except that time  $t$  should be replaced by “reduced” time  $\tilde{t}$ . The reduced time is the time measured in units of the relaxation time (which in general itself changes with time during the experiment). More precisely, the reduced time is defined by

$$d\tilde{t} = \frac{dt}{\tau(W(t))}. \quad (2)$$

Suppose  $Y$  is a quantity which is measured in an experiment where the temperature varies. Writing  $Y = Y_0 + Y_r$  where  $Y_0$  is the part of  $Y$  that changes instantaneously with temperature and  $Y_r$  is the “relaxing” part of  $Y$ , the TN formalism predicts that a function  $\phi$  exists such that

$$\Delta Y_r(\tilde{t}) = \int_0^\infty d\tilde{t}' \phi(\tilde{t}') \Delta T(\tilde{t} - \tilde{t}'). \quad (3)$$

Here  $\Delta Y_r$  is the change of  $Y_r$  from some reference state in thermal equilibrium at the beginning of the experiment (and similarly for  $\Delta T$ ).

We shall only consider temperature jump experiments, i.e., where the system is in thermal equilibrium until at  $t = 0$  the temperature changes suddenly. In such experiments, if the variable  $X$  is defined by  $X(t) = C\Delta Y(t)/\Delta T$  where  $C$  is determined from the condition  $X \rightarrow 1$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , the TN formalism implies that a function  $f$  exists such that

$$X(t) = f(\tilde{t}). \quad (4)$$

It is straightforward to express  $f$  in terms of  $\phi$  and the instantaneous jump of  $X$ . Note that  $X$  includes the instantaneous contribution to  $\Delta Y$ ,  $\Delta Y_0$ , and thus the function  $f$  begins at a nonzero value for  $\tilde{t} = 0$ .

Equation (4) implies

$$\frac{dX}{dt} = \frac{f'(\tilde{t})}{\tau(W(t))}, \quad (5)$$

which in turn via Eq. (1) implies

$$\ln\left(\frac{dX}{dt}\right) = \ln[f'(\tilde{t})/\tau_0] - W \quad (6)$$

Consider now two temperature jump experiments. Each obey Eq. (6) and consequently by subtraction at the same reduced time

$$\Delta \ln\left(\frac{dX}{dt}\right) = -\Delta W. \quad (7)$$

Since the measured quantity  $X$  is a function of reduced time (Eq. (4)), in practice the subtraction is performed by subtracting the two experiments *at the same value of  $X$* . The purpose of the subtraction, of course, is to eliminate  $f$ .

Equation (7) is valid for the subtraction of any two temperature jump experiments. A particularly simple situation, however, arises when the first experiment is an “infinitesimal” structural relaxation experiment, i.e., with a temperature step so small that  $W$  does not change significantly during the entire experiment. In this case the left hand side of Eq. (7) is essentially  $W$  of the second (nonlinear) experiment. Extrapolating to zero time gives us the instantaneous contribution to  $W$ .

Having established a method for the determination of  $W$ , we return to the comparison of the entropy model to the two others. What is the prediction of the entropy model for the instantaneous contribution to  $W$ ? Suppose the nonlinear experiment is a jump from temperature  $T_1$  to  $T_2$ . From an “infinitesimal” structural relaxation experiment around  $T_1$  the equilibrium value of  $W$  at  $T_1$ ,  $W_1$ , is known. Plotting the left hand side of Eq. (7) as a function of  $X$  now makes it possible to investigate how large  $W$ ’s instantaneous contribution is: According to the entropy model, right after  $t = 0$   $W$  is equal to  $W_1 T_1/T_2$ , because for this model only the  $T$  in the expression for  $W$  can change instantaneously. If a larger instantaneous contribution is found, the entropy model in its extension to deal with structural relaxation is not viable.

To test the entropy model we recently performed an experiment along the lines presented above [1] [talk given by N. B. Olsen at the Fourth International Discussion Meeting on Relaxations in Complex Systems, Crete, June 18.-23., 2001]. The experiment is an improved version of one described in [3]. The quantity monitored during the structural relaxation,  $Y$ , is the instantaneous shear modulus, which can be measured by a resonance technique with 20 ppm relative accuracy (5% absolute accuracy). With the new reduced-size piezo-ceramic transducer, the time constant for the thermal setup is now only 20 seconds. The experiment was done on the silicone oil DC704 with temperatures during the experiment in the range 207-208 K. The nonlinear temperature jump was 1.5 K, the “infinitesimal” jump was 0.15 K. The cryostat is able to keep the temperature constant within 0.1 mK over months; the actual experiment monitored three structural relaxations, each lasting 10 days. - The experiment showed that there is an instantaneous contribution to  $W$  which is twice as large as that predicted by the entropy model. On the other hand, the results are consistent with the shoving model.

---

[1] We here briefly discuss a few points which will be considered in more detail as part of a forthcoming publication.

[2] J. C. Dyre, N. B. Olsen, and T. Christensen, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 2171 (1996); J. C. Dyre, J. Non-Cryst. Solids **235-237**, 142 (1998).

[3] N. B. Olsen, J. C. Dyre, and T. Christensen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1031 (1998).